

---

**GCSE**  
**HISTORY**  
**8145/1B/D**

Paper 1 Section B/D: Conflict and tension in Asia, 1950–1975

---

Mark scheme

June 2021

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

#### Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

### Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

### Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

### Step 3 Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG)

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in question 04.

	<b>Performance descriptor</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy</li><li>• Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall</li><li>• Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate</li></ul>	4 marks
Intermediate performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy</li><li>• Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall</li><li>• Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate</li></ul>	2–3 marks
Threshold performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy</li><li>• Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall</li><li>• Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate</li></ul>	1 mark
No marks awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The learner writes nothing</li><li>• The learner's response does not relate to the question</li><li>• The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning</li></ul>	0 marks

Question 04 is an extended response question. They give students the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	1

**Source A** supports the Strategic Hamlets programme. How do you know?

Explain your answer using **Source A** and your contextual knowledge.

**[4 marks]**

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

**Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**

**Level 2: Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 3–4**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the programme was introduced in 1962 by Diem's government to stop the Vietcong gaining support from peasants in villages. The leaflet shows that the Americans tried to win the 'hearts and minds' of South Vietnamese people by offering them protection.

**Level 1: Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 1–2**

Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the Americans helped to build the new hamlets; the leaflet shows that the hamlet is guarded and safe.

**Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0**

0	2
---	---

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to an historian studying the widening of the Vietnam War into Cambodia and Laos?

Explain your answer using **Sources B** and **C** and your contextual knowledge.

**[12 marks]**

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

**Target**

**Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**  
**Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)**

In analysing and evaluating sources, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

**Level 4: Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance** **10–12**

Students may progress from a developed evaluation of the sources by complex reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and provenance. They may evaluate the relationship between the sources based on analysis of provenance and contextual knowledge.

For example, the sources show how opinions within the US army changed over time. The contemporary Source C is mocking the army for ignoring the rising death toll and still believing in 1972 that it was possible to defeat communism. Whereas the admission in Source B is that, with hindsight, the Vietcong tactics were impossible to defeat regardless of America's military strength.

**Level 3: Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance** **7–9**

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful because it is an admission by an American veteran that the widening of the war against Cambodia and Laos was ineffective. The Ho Chi Minh Trail ran from North Vietnam through Cambodia and Laos covering thousands of miles. It was not a single track and so despite being bombed in many places, porters could always find an alternative route to get supplies to the Vietcong.

Source C is useful to show that by 1972 public opinion no longer accepted Domino Theory as sufficient justification for the attack on Cambodia and Laos. The war had been widened to destroy Vietcong bases in the countries that neighboured Vietnam but when an invasion of Cambodia was launched there was a lot of protest.

**Level 2: Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance 4–6**

Students may progress from a basic analysis of the source(s) to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful because it explains why the war was widened. The Americans tried to cut off supplies to the Vietcong by destroying the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos. Source C is useful because it is a critical opinion of widening the war. The message of the cartoon is that the Domino Theory has cost a lot of lives.

**Level 1: Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3**

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Source B says the attacks on Laos were kept secret. Source C shows that the war widened into other countries because of the Domino Theory.

**Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0**

0	3
---	---

Write an account of how the media and TV influenced American opinions about the Vietnam War.

[8 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

**Target**      **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)**  
**Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)**

**Level 4:**      **Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**      **7–8**

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and /or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example, analysis of different consequences of free press. Media and TV influenced opinion in different ways. Not only did they show the reality of conflict but they also revealed the army's attempts to distort reality. This served to undermine public trust in the Government and support for the war effort was diminished. The truth of the events that took place in My Lai in 1968 was revealed by a journalist 18 months after it occurred. Public opinion was not only influenced by events of the massacre but also the dishonesty of the army who had claimed the operation was a success.

**Level 3:**      **Developed analysis of causation/consequence**      **5–6**  
**Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, journalists had a significant influence over public opinion; when the reporter Walter Cronkite declared that the war was unwinnable after he witnessed the events of the Tet Offensive, President Johnson admitted that this would reduce support for the war across the whole country.

<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Simple analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>3–4</b>
	<p>Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example, most American homes had a television by the 1960s and there were hundreds of journalists reporting from Vietnam. New technology enabled journalists to capture and transmit uncensored footage of the war zone.</p>	
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>1–2</b>
	<p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as people saw shocking images of warfare on their home televisions every day.</p>	
	<b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Question 04 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	4
---	---

‘American actions were the main reason for the development of the Korean War.’

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

[16 marks]  
[SPaG 4 marks]

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

<b>Target</b>	<b>Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)</b> <b>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)</b>	
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement</b> <b>Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b> Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.  Extends Level 3.  Students may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement.  For example, the war developed because of the wider context of the Cold War between the USA and the USSR; neither side was willing to see their rival gain any more global influence via Korea. Both superpowers used it as a proxy war to spread the influence of their respective ideologies. By fighting in Korea, it allowed the USSR to try and make another country become communist which prompted America to fight back and enact its policy of containment.	<b>13–16</b>

---

**Level 3:      Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s)      9–12**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding**  
**that is relevant to the question**

Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

Students may progress from a simple explanation of causation with developed reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the war developed in 1951 because the Americans decided to use their air power to achieve a decisive blow and break the stalemate around the 38th parallel. US planes bombed North Korea with explosives and napalm resulting in a huge death toll.

For example, another important factor that caused the war to develop was the hidden support given by Stalin to the Communist forces of China and North Korea. Stalin saw an opportunity to fight a 'proxy war' against the USA. The USSR supplied equipment to the North Koreans and China rather than engage in direct fighting against American forces.

**Level 2:      Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s)      5–8**  
**Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is**  
**relevant to the question**

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

Students may progress from a basic explanation of causation by simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, China warned General MacArthur not to advance beyond the 38th parallel and sent troops to fight when the warning was ignored.

**Level 1: Basic explanation of one or more factors** **1–4**  
**Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Answer demonstrates a basic line of reasoning, which is coherent, structured with some substantiation; the relevance might be implicit.

Students recognise and provide a basic explanation of one or more factors.

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as the USA sent an invasion force to help South Korea.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, China joined the war and sent troops to fight in Korea.

**Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question** **0**

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar**

	<b>Performance descriptor</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	4 marks
Intermediate performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	2–3 marks
Threshold performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	1 mark
No marks awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The learner writes nothing</li> <li>• The learner's response does not relate to the question</li> <li>• The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning</li> </ul>	0 marks